

DEC 21 1925

# The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Monday, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.  
Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.  
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 28, 1918.

VOL. XIX, No. 9

MONDAY, DECEMBER 14, 1925

WHOLE NO. 512

## The Library of Greek Thought

*One of the most convenient, scholarly and illuminating  
reference mediums for those interested in Greek sources.*

### GREEK ECONOMICS

Introduction and translations by M. L. W. LAISTNER, *Reader in Ancient History, University of London.*

Contains translations of the discussions of Plato, Aristotle, Xenophon, Solon, and other Greek thinkers which deal with economic theory, including the whole of the earliest known treatise, "Eryxias".

### GREEK CIVILIZATION AND CHARACTER

Introduction and translations by ARNOLD J. TOYNBEE.

An independent picture of Hellenic civilization and the social psychology of the Greeks as shown in their democracy, theatre, social relations, and their public standards.

### GREEK SOCIAL LIFE

By F. A. WRIGHT

A collection of extracts (translated) from the dramatists, historians, and orators of ancient Greece which give intimate glimpses of the private life, thought, and diversions of the Athenians, typical of the other states of Greece.

### GREEK RELIGIOUS THOUGHT

Introduction and translations by F. M. CORNFORD, *Trinity College, Cambridge.*

Aims to set before the reader, by translated extracts from Greek authors, what the Greeks from Homer to Alexander thought about the world, the gods and their relations with man, the nature and destiny of the soul, and the significance of human life.

### GREEK LITERARY CRITICISM

By J. D. DENNISTON, *Hertford College, Oxford.*

Poetry, drama, letters and other forms of Greek literary art are presented in a manner that will serve as an introduction or as a further study in this model field of literature.

### GREEK HISTORICAL THOUGHT

Introduction and translations by ARNOLD J. TOYNBEE with two pieces newly translated by Gilbert Murray.

Not merely the expected passages from standard historians but also contributions from poets, scientists, philosophers who dealt with the course of events from the time of Homer to that of Heraclius.

### GREEK ETHICAL THOUGHT FROM HOMER TO THE STOICS

By HILDA D. OAKELEY, *Reader in Philosophy, Kings College, University of London*  
*Author of History and Progress and Other Essays and Addresses.*

An epitome of Greek ethical thought, from the rude times of Homer to the over-civilized period of Marcus Aurelius, presented in extracts (translated) which illustrate the Socratic principle of self-knowledge, Plato's exposition of Beauty, Symmetry and Truth, the often misinterpreted Aristotelian doctrine of 'the mean', and the cardinal points of the teachings of the Epicureans and the Stoics.

Each volume, \$2.00, postage extra

E. P. Dutton & Co., Publishers, 681 Fifth Ave., N. Y.

## They Meet the New Requirements In Latin

### Harkness, Kirtland and Williams' Cicero's Nine Orations and Impeachment of Verres

Including the First Oration against Catiline, the Oration for  
Archias and the newly prescribed **Plunder of Syracuse**...\$1.72

### Gleason's A Term of Ovid, Revised

Including these required selections from the **Metamorphoses**:  
**Deucalion and Pyrrha, Phaethon, The Golden Fleece, Philemon**  
**and Baucis, and Atalanta's Race**.....\$1.12

### Cicero's Impeachment of Verres (Wightman)

Providing in pamphlet form this new requirement not generally  
found in school editions of Cicero's Orations .....\$0.16

---

## AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA

*Including  
all material  
necessary for the  
Third Year*



*Meeting  
the College  
Requirements for  
1926-1928*

## MOORE'S ORATIONS OF CICERO

Edited by Professor Frank Gardner Moore, of Columbia University, this new Cicero is in the spirit of the recommendations of the recent Classical Investigation. It provides a wider range of reading than is commonly offered, and includes grammar, composition, sight reading, and much historical matter.

Catalogue price, \$1.96

BOSTON

GINN AND COMPANY

NEW YORK

CHICAGO

ATLANTA

DALLAS

COLUMBUS

SAN FRANCISCO

# The Classical Weekly

VOL. XIX, No. 9

MONDAY, DECEMBER 14, 1925

WHOLE No. 512

## LATIN PARADIGM EFFICIENCY IN THE FIRST YEAR<sup>1</sup>

My attention was first drawn to the choice of paradigms by a boy whom I was tutoring several years ago. He had declined *castra* like a noun of the first declension. When he was corrected, he said, "Oh! I thought it went like *ursa*". The frequent use of the expression "What does it go like"? is as significant as its bad grammar. I discovered that the boy's governess had chosen *ursa* as a paradigm of the first declension, no doubt to fortify her pupil against the time, three and one-half years later, when he should meet the word (*Aeneid* 5.37). Upon further investigation, I found that, for the second declension, *ursus* was the paradigm. This word, no doubt, anticipated Ovid, *Met.* 2.494, four or five years later.

From this experience, it was evident that a wide range of choice was open to the paradigm-seeker, and that the words he chose were apt to reflect his natural tastes, be they military, agrarian, or zoological.

The Latin words whose forms and meanings become most familiar to the first year Latin student are, most certainly, the paradigms of the various inflections. This is so obviously true that it seems necessary merely again to mention that pupils, when meeting a new word, invariably refer to the printed paradigms in the text-book which they are using to 'see what it goes like'. Persons whose study, if it may be so called, has carried them no farther than the first year of Latin usually remember few Latin words, but they always remember at least one or two and those are the paradigms which their text-books used. It is interesting to note, in passing, how consistently and thoroughly they mispronounce them. Since the group of paradigms, which, in the first year, includes forty or fifty words, is so firmly impressed upon the students' minds, it is important that the words it contains be chosen, not fortuitously, but with great care.

If there is anyone who does not realize how completely beginners are the creatures of their paradigms, I may say that I have tried an experiment with some four hundred boys, to discover whether any one of them would fail to refer to his paradigms at once upon meeting a new word. I wrote the words "*ora, orae, feminine*" on the blackboard, and asked each pupil to put down some word which "went like *ora*". Exactly one hundred per cent of them put down the paradigms which they had used. Six different text-books were represented. In fact, I gained quite a reputation as a magician by telling each pupil what text-book he had been using.

<sup>1</sup>This paper was read at the Nineteenth Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, held at Swarthmore College, May 2, 1925.

Choice of paradigms should be governed by their efficiency. Mechanical efficiency is defined as the ratio of the amount of work delivered by a machine to the amount of work put into it, or, more technically, of output over input. I define paradigm efficiency as the ratio of the amount of service to the student, gained from learning a paradigm, to the amount of energy put into learning it. Two factors, therefore, determine the efficiency of a paradigm, the output and the input.

With these two factors in mind, I have set up two groups of criteria for use in choosing paradigms. The first group I call the Input Group, since it is concerned with reducing to a minimum the difficulties of learning an inflection. The second group I call the Output Group, since it is concerned with assuring to the student a maximum of service from his paradigms. It is difficult to satisfy all six criteria with every paradigm, but the closer we can come to doing so, the more efficient will be our paradigms.

### GROUP I

#### The Input Group

- (1) A paradigm should be absolutely free from any sort of irregularity of use or meaning.
- (2) A paradigm should be easy to pronounce.
- (3) A paradigm should have some common English derivatives.

### GROUP II

#### The Output Group

- (1) A paradigm should occur as often as possible in authors to be read.
- (2) A paradigm should, whenever possible, contain a root which occurs frequently in other Latin words.
- (3) A paradigm should be adaptable to use in composition and conversation.

#### Group I

(1) Irregularities are of many varieties. It is at once apparent that *agricola*, because of its gender, is unfit for a paradigm, while *mare*, on account of its ablative singular and its genitive plural, is technically so. I see no reason, however, why *mare* should not be treated as regular, since there is no other word to substitute for it in the paradigms. At least, if it is used, it should be treated as normal. *Dies* also, usually given as a paradigm, is unfit for such use, on account of its gender. There are other irregularities and difficulties, more numerous, and less obvious, than these, which must be noted. Such difficulties usually arise from a difference of idiom, or some other translation trouble. *Voco* will become confused with *appello*, *habeo* with *teneo*; *pugno* will be used transitively, as in English; *fuga* is awkward in the plural in English translation. These difficulties

must, of course, be straightened out in time, but they should not be presented with the paradigms. The whole point of the first and second criteria is that to the difficulties of learning inflections we should not add other difficulties, inherent in the paradigms themselves.

(2) Ease of pronunciation is, of course, very important. Other things being equal, I think dissyllables make the best paradigms. Unaccustomed sounds should be avoided; any awkward combination of sounds is undesirable. I have not yet found a beginner who could pronounce the principal parts of *vulnero* correctly at first. The same is true of *armo* and *proficiscor*.

(3) Latin in English is a sufficiently important objective at any time to justify this criterion.

### Group II

(1) Frequency of occurrence I believe to be the most important criterion of any in either group. I shall assume here that the authors to be read are Caesar, Cicero, and Vergil. All paradigms, then, must occur frequently in Caesar and thereafter.

(2) Paradigms should contain roots which are common in other Latin words, thus forming a vocabulary nucleus about which may be built up a substantial vocabulary. Many new words may be very quickly learned if there are words already familiar with which they may be associated.

(3) When noun-paradigms and verb-paradigms are being learned, the commoner ablative constructions and expressions of place are the most important points of syntax. Obviously, it is better, when teaching a new principle of syntax, to illustrate it with words already familiar in form and in meaning than to be forced to introduce new words expressly for the purpose.

These six criteria, then, although they are often difficult to satisfy simultaneously, should, in every case, govern the choice of a paradigm. Practice in inflection should not be restricted to paradigms, of course, since they form only about one-seventh of the vocabulary of the first year. Yet I hope I have made it clear that the ultimate objective in their choice should be a maximum of service for a minimum of effort.

Listed below are the paradigms for the first declension and the first conjugation taken from six first year books in common use. A brief examination of them shows that nearly all of them fail to satisfy one or more of the six criteria.

First Declension	First Conjugation
BOOK A aqua	voco
BOOK B agricola	amo
BOOK C domina	amo
BOOK D porta	amo
BOOK E stella	amo
BOOK F tuba	porto

Of these nouns, *agricola* has already been mentioned. None of the others, except *porta*, satisfies the frequency-of-occurrence criterion. I consider this ample ground for their disqualification as paradigms. Water undoubtedly abounded in Gaul, but it passes under other names, such as *flumen*. Stars must have been in the

Gallic sky, but, because of their regular appearance and orderly behavior, they escaped official notice. *Dominae* were surely not common on the battlefields of Gaul.

Trouble with *voco* is avoided if it is translated by 'summon'. *Porto* does not occur often enough. *Amo* never occurs, except in composition.

In paradigms of the third declension I think it is necessary merely to distinguish consonant-stems, mixed-stems, and *i*-stems, giving enough words to illustrate each type in its most common forms. It is useless to classify, at this time, such words according to their individual stem-endings.

The list of paradigms which I have chosen is based on the course made up of Caesar, Cicero, and Vergil, first, because the majority of Latin teachers are most familiar with the text of those authors, and so can readily investigate the reasons for my choice; secondly, because a great many Schools either cannot or will not adopt the eclectic reading course. For such Schools, this list may prove of immediate service.

DECLENSIONS		CONJUGATIONS			
Nouns	Adjectives	Regular	Deponent	Semi-deponent	Imper-sonal
porta		voco	conor	audeo	licet
servus	magnus	moneo	vereor		
bellum	liber				
puer	noster				
ager					
vir					
dux	miles	fortis	duco	sequor	confido
pater	victor	fortior	capio	patior	accidit
rex	civitas	audax			
caput	tempus	celer			
genus	nomen	acer			
		praesens			
hostis	cohors				
mons	animal				
(mare)					
exercitus			audio	potior <sup>2</sup>	
cornu					
res	acies				

WILLIAM PENN CHARTER SCHOOL,  
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

JOHN F. GUMMERE

### REVIEWS

Horace: A New Interpretation. By Archibald Y. Campbell. London: Methuen and Company (1924). Pp. xii + 303. 12 sh., 6 d.

This is at once a lively and an instructive book. It is vigorously, at times even provocatively written, and it combines a close study of the poet with an enlivening use of 'modern instances'. Much of it should, for full profit, be read with the Latin text of Horace within reach, that full justice may be done to the author's exact reasoning on thought and structure. I cordially endorse a great deal of the emphasis laid by Professor Campbell upon what is his central thesis—the religious, moral, and social value of Horace. I am, in fact, logically bound to do so, for my Literary History of Rome contains the statement (517) that "the solid morality with which Horace interwove his jocund merriment is part of his versatility". It is a pleasure to find that on certain points the author has done me the honor of referring to my views. The reassertion of the 'religious-moral' aspect of poetry is a greatly

<sup>2</sup>There is no satisfactory paradigm for deponent verbs of the fourth conjugation, *Potior* may be introduced after deponents are mastered.



needed antidote to much poisonous theorizing about poetry nowadays and much trumpery production. According to some critics art must be less aesthetic if it teaches anything, and the corollary would seem to be that one should never ask for meaning in artistic work. Adherents of this school give color to the modern notion that poetry is parasitic upon life, and they will not readily agree with Professor Campbell's wise insistence on the educative, admonitory, persuasive power of poetry. The doctrine of 'art for art's sake' suits the more limited type of genius that does not and cannot crown delight with durable benefit. As the author says (64), "...there always have been in all the arts persons who have admired themselves and been admired for conjuring with one ball instead of twenty; to do an obvious thing pretentiously is the way to make a reputation in poetry as elsewhere". The stress laid upon Horace's social mission is, in my opinion, a proper testimony to the value of a poet who was no flippant trifler in verse or insincere purveyor of compliments to those in high place, but a seriously minded lover of his country, intensely concerned with its welfare. Professor Campbell, however, would go further: he argues powerfully for a just appreciation of the religious worth of Horace, who as 'a priest of the Muses' performed genuinely sacerdotal functions.

The book is divided into two parts: I, General (1-127), II, Particular (128-229). The four chapters of Part I discuss A Classic as Seen by Romantics (1-25), The Function of Poetry in the Ancient World (26-55), Horace's Own Theory and Practice of Poetry (56-81), <Horace's> Life and Work (82-127). Part II contains a thorough-going application of the author's thesis to Horace's works in chronological order: V, Experiment: The Epodes (128-146), VI, Feeling after Form: The Satires (147-191), VII, Composition: The Odes (192-232), VIII, Compromise: The Ars Poetica and Epistles (233-289), Epilogue (290-299). There is also an Index (301-303).

Not infrequently there are pronouncements which may strike a reader as paradoxical. It is maintained, for instance, in order to explain why the eighteenth century failed to grasp the real point of the Horatian ode, that the eighteenth century, so far from being a genuine classic age, was rather romantic (12), and on the other hand that the 'Romantic Revival' was much more really a classic revival (14). But the paradoxes bear examination: they stimulate thought, and they are truer than a good many contemporary paradoxes are. Critics are accustomed to forget—and some apparently will never learn—how much the Romantic Movement owed, as did the Renaissance, to a reawakened joy in the literature of Greece.

Chapter II, on the ritual origin of art, and on literary cycles, takes us too far afield. The author admits that it may be stiff reading, and dispenses the reader from regarding it as essential to the understanding of the remaining chapters. Originally, we are told, more than three times its present length, it still contains much of great interest, though more (to my way of thinking) than is indispensable to the main thesis. At the same

time, it is to be hoped that the author will yet give us, in a separate volume, the fuller treatment of his new theory of poetry, or rehabilitation of the ancient theory. There are in this chapter some excellent remarks (51-54) on the early *satura*, designed to lead up to the special study of Horatian satire later in the work.

The next chapter—a general investigation into Horace's poetic practice—clearly sets forth the author's conception of that broad literary religion on behalf of which Horace claimed to hold his sacerdotal commission or priesthood of the Muses. It concludes with a formulation of principles applied with enlightening ingenuity in the separate chapter on the Odes. Two of these principles are (81) "that an ode of Horace is ostensibly either a hymn or a prayer or an exhortation" and "that it is couched in an oratorical style, is highly rhetorical, and being directed to the feelings rather than the reason, is apt to be characterized by striking transitions of mood, often abrupt".

Among interesting points raised by criticisms in the study of the poet's life is the question whether we have not a potential dramatist lost in Horace. He possessed many of the requisite qualities—more of them, certainly, than the writers of the over-advertised but abortive type of drama with a thesis to defend. The fact remains that Horace did not essay drama, and no one can convincingly assure us whether the reason was his laziness or his deficiency in the full combination of indispensable gifts. Some interest, at least, in drama was present at the close of his lyric period; but instead of writing drama he wrote about it in the *Ars Poetica* (121).

The detailed survey of Horace's works (128-289) makes a valuable contribution to Horatian exegesis. First the Epodes are classified and analyzed in a manner free from the customary dullness of classification and analysis. There is, besides, a careful and independent examination of the probable date of such Epodes as have historical bearing. The traditional view is not always adopted: indeed, the tone of various Epodes regarding current events must, in the absence of definite allusions, leave openings for subjective judgments. These, it may be said, are reasonably put.

When satire is reached, we are told (148) that "To trace the progress of his artistic apprenticeship is one of the main interests of a study of the earliest of his three periods of work". Here the Bionaeon or Lucilian elements are noted in contradistinction to the Ennian elements of satire. Says our author (156):

Thus, then, by Ennius and Lucilius, are the two new types of Republican *satura* inaugurated; by the two gates they opened is the whole herd of Greek mime-literature let into that rank no-man's land. For motley though the herd is, they *are* ultimately of the same genus. "Attic salt" or "black salt", the wit is always a different thing from the imaginative humour of Aristophanes.

It is maintained that, from the standpoint of such literary influences, Quintilian's claim for satire as totally Roman needs qualification—and yet, in spite of Greek elements, not so much qualification to my mind as is suggested. Due attention is called to the change of form and style in the Satires of Book 2 and to Horace's

growing Stoicism. The author is, by the way, too hard on the fifth Satire of Book 1, though what reader of it has ever failed to feel tantalized by its reticence regarding figures like Vergil and Varius? No doubt there is much in this piece about water, and Professor Campbell makes fair sport of this—but then poor Horace was on low diet, we must remember, and off his wine! In any case water has always been an important topic in Italy.

The sketch of Greek lyric preceding the study of the Odes will help the ordinary reader better to understand the criticisms and comparisons in the chapter. The chapter is designed to explain the conception of Horace's Odes as the consummation of ancient lyric—the synthesis of the simple and the ornate styles. There are instructive studies of the alternation between grave and gay (201–202) and of the Pindaric strain (203–210). But we are never long without reminder that the sacerdotal function of the Odes is a reality. And unquestionably many of them lose their real meaning and application if they are treated as lyric trifles and mythological exercises. I remember an occasion some years ago when the late Dr. Warde Fowler expressed to me his great satisfaction over Dr. Walter Leaf's discovery of the hidden meaning of Odes 1.14<sup>1</sup>. There is, in truth, a danger in not taking Horace seriously enough; and one feels it illuminating in many ways to bear in mind that such an Ode as 3.21, 'To a Wine-jar' (O nata mecum consule Manlio), is a hymn. The ancient sacred forms of hymn, prayer, and invocation determined the structure and the spirit of many of the Odes, even where they are demonstrably secular in reference. Horace is not always on the high horse; but he is oftener so mounted than is generally understood. His very playfulness is at times blended with serious thought.

On the other hand, it may reasonably be questioned whether the sacerdotal theory sufficiently allows for the possibility of lighter verse being composed for its own sake, as mere sportive flippancy or persiflage. Neque semper arcum tendit Apollo—and does Horace, though *Musarum sacerdos*, never unbend? Professor Campbell would reply that even the more frivolous Odes subserve the set purpose, useful at a turning-point in history, of inducing Roman readers to believe that life must not be regarded too seriously: society was safer politically if relaxation were found in carousals and love-making (113). So, then, the erotic odes are "jam round the political pill". The attitude is perhaps more Machiavellian than sacerdotal.

In the final chapter the *Ars Poetica* is referred not to the last years of Horace's life, but to a date between the issue of Odes 1–3 (23 B. C.) and the issue of Epistles 1 (about 20 B. C.). According to the theory of literary cycles previously stated by Professor Campbell, the lyric stage should in a complete poet be succeeded by the dramatic. Horace, then, though he does not himself write drama, proclaims that the great want in Roman literature for the moment is drama; and the interesting reminder is put forward that his advice to develop the satyr play (which might have borne entertaining fruit) was never acted upon.

<sup>1</sup>I gave an abstract of Dr. Leaf's paper on this subject, in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 15.150–151. C. K.

It will be noted that Professor Campbell is not a purist; he is not unwilling to employ a colloquialism like "enthused". Certainly his scholarship is not overlaid with pedantry. There are, however, some iterations which might have been avoided. For instance, since the notion of Bacchus as a refining influence and tamer of unruly monsters has already been duly supported by references on page 62, a briefer allusion to the matter would suffice on page 106.

There are also points in the author's interpretation and views with which not everyone will agree, but he frankly allows "every man to his opinion". He expects, and probably deserves, to get into trouble for his verdict that Quintilian was as stupid a critic as he was a master of transparent prose. Disappointing as are many of Quintilian's label-like dicta, they are not those of a stupid critic, but of one who is all the time thinking in a matter-of-fact way about the orator's training. Quintilian, who was not primarily a literary critic, moves in shackles, but his performance within its limits is a wonderful one.

In the Epilogue, room is found for a few delightful glances at some of the beauties of Horace's verse and for a summary estimate of his greatness. Professor Campbell does not shrink (299) from making the high literary claim for Horace that he stands out among ancient poets "as an original singer of the first order, and at the same time a student and critic; a completely conscious artist, with a consistently thought-out and thoroughly applied theory of poetry".

ARMSTRONG COLLEGE,  
NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE

J. WIGHT DUFF

Horace and his Art of Enjoyment. By Elizabeth Hazelton Haight. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company (1925). Pp. vii + 276. \$3.00.

A new book on Horace should justify itself, if not by the presentation of facts about Horace hitherto unknown or misinterpreted, or by the propounding of an original theory regarding his life and literary activity, at least by a well-ordered discussion of the theories of others, or by a new interpretation of old matter, or by a quickening of the poet's message and a fresh evaluation of that message for the men of to-day. One would expect that such aims would find fulfillment in a book bearing the title Horace and his Art of Enjoyment. For, if Horace made of the art of living, as Miss Haight says (4), "a fine art of enjoyment", one would like to discover the rules of his art in order that they might be of service to us in these days; surely, living was never less of an art or more of a business than it is to-day. We are told, however, very little about Horace's art of enjoyment except in a way that is, I am afraid, not of much help, that he achieved it, namely, "from seeing life steadily and whole" (4), and that it "involved living, feeling, philosophizing, and the power of expressing what he felt and thought" (270). This attractive topic is all but lost in a mass of details bearing rather on Horace's life and times and verse.

The matter contained in the short introductory chapter, The Poet and his Time (1–4), is repeated in

greater detail in the following chapter, *The Making of a Poet* (5-45). Here Miss Haight discusses in entertaining fashion the factors which were of most influence in determining and shaping the thoughts and purposes and ideals of "the little country boy of Venusia"—the influence of his father, his student days in Rome and Athens, his experiences as a soldier in the Republican army under Brutus, and as a *scriba* in the quaestor's office. One may doubt whether the two or three years of University life in Athens played the large part which Miss Haight ascribes to them in giving Horace his intimate and wide knowledge of Greek literature and philosophy, but her analysis of the effect of such knowledge, from whatever source it came, upon his poetry is true enough. She interrupts the account of Horace's personal history by several pages (36-43) of argument, which is drawn entirely from her interpretation of his own writings, to prove that Horace was an *eques*, without a hint that there is any evidence against this theory. She is so sure of its truth that she can begin a paragraph on page 40 with the words, "In view of the fact that Horace was an *eques* . . .", and see Horace himself in "the knight behind whom black care sits" (39, 42), and consider *Carm.* 3.16, in spite of the fact that its sole theme is "saint-seducing gold", "good evidence that Horace was a refugee from the ranks of the *cursus honorum*" (42). Stern self-criticism, such as the author applies to herself on page 31, would have led her to see in much of this also "pure fancy".

The following chapter, *Patronage and the Poet* (46-53), is a pleasant account of Horace's ideas on the subject of patronage and of his relation to Maecenas, but too fanciful again is the interpretation of *Serm.* 2.1 as a truthful account of an actual visit paid by Horace to the lawyer Trebatius. Her conclusion is (61-62), that it was because of Trebatius's advice that Horace, after he had published his first three books of *Odes* and had returned to *Sermones*, "discarded personal invective for the genial tone of the poetic epistle . . ." (62; the same opinion, in one form or another, is expressed on pages 74, 76, 79). This difference of tone does exist between certain *Sermones* of the first book and those of the second book and the *Epistles*, but nothing could be more genial than this very *Sermo*, in which, as Professor Morris notes, not an argument is to be taken seriously.

The chapter on Augustus and Horace (64-82), which deals with the aims of Augustus as ruler and of Horace's attitude to the new régime, is free from the diffuseness and flights of fancy which too often mar the following chapter, *Life in Rome Through Horace's Eyes* (83-145). Here we find a description of Rome's streets, buildings, the occupations of her people, their manner of work and play, of dressing and dining, all presented, for the most part, by the means of paraphrase or translation of Horace's own writings. *Epodes* and *Sermones*, *Odes* and *Epistles* are all made to contribute biographical

material<sup>2</sup>, although Miss Haight herself recognizes (130) the danger in this procedure. As she well says (130-131), "A poet who wrote Latin satire was led by its traditions into dialogue or dramatic presentation of his theme. The demands of epodes and odes no less than of elegiac verse were for the personal pronoun of the first person whether the ego was writing of real or imaginary experience", but she is not consistent in bearing these facts in mind. Davus's preachment to his master on his bondage to illicit love (*Serm.* 2.7. 45 ff.), she dismisses as hardly autobiographical (130), but, later on (136), she finds in this same satire "the germ of his revolt against the corruption of the times". *Epode* 11 "might seem based on real experience were not the themes the typical and oft-repeated motifs of the elegiac poetry of the age . . ." (131), but *Epode* 15, with its "one long sentence of rage" (where, one would like to know?), and its "exquisite reminiscences of that night when in the pure moonlight she <= Neaera> and Flaccus had plighted eternal troth" (131-132; cf. 193), "is the one lyric in which something of the flame of Catullus burns" (132). If, however, the criteria of reality are the typical literary commonplaces of the elegy, surely *Epode* 15 is no more or no less a record of real experiences than *Epode* 11. In both we have the faithless maiden, the successful rival, the disconsolate lover who finds comfort in another love, while the language is the erotic phraseology of comedy, elegy, epigram. Both themes and language, moreover, are reechoed, as Miss Haight notes (137), in the *Odes*, of which, she aptly remarks (137), "The psychology is true, however imaginary the situation or conventional the motif". Notwithstanding this, she maintains that *Carm.* 3.12 shows "how girls of the time were chafing under surveillance and criticism and longing to lead as free a life as their brothers" (139). And she interprets this poem in the light of the poems of Sulpicia, a real Roman girl, "in spite of all recent critics" (140). How time flies when Kirby Smith can be classed among the *antiqui*! She sees, also, a distinct advance in Horace's attitude towards problems of sex between the period of the *Sermones* and that of the *Odes*, and believes that *Sermones* 2.7 marks the turning-point. One may ask, however, which is the more moral, Horace the lover of a *matrona* in *Sermones* 2.7, or Horace the lover of Lyce, *saevo nupta viro*, of *Carmina* 3.10, an *Ode*, by the way, which Miss Haight does not mention. To interpret as serious self-revelation every utterance which Horace makes about himself not only leads one into strange inconsistencies, but robs his poetry of half its fun and value. The change in Horace from youth to middle age was not, I am convinced, a change in his standards of morality—these were always high—but rather a change in his method and manner of expression, and these, in turn, were largely the result of the change in his social environment. How difficult it is to measure periods of Horace's inner life by what he himself says of

<sup>1</sup>Her arguments are largely those presented by Professor Lily Ross Taylor in *American Journal of Philology* 46.161-170. Miss Taylor says all that can be said for that side of the question. Horace's own words, however, about himself, in *Serm.* 2.1.75, *infra Lucili censum*, cannot be rejected as cavalierly as Miss Taylor rejects them (164, note 15).

<sup>2</sup>Her judgment in this matter may be contrasted with that of Heinze, *Neue Jahrbücher* 26 (1923), 153 ff., who finds that one of the fundamental differences between an ode of Horace and a modern lyric is the fact that the ode is not autobiographical.



it Miss Haight recognizes later, when she remarks (264), in speaking of *Sermones* 2.3, and 2.7, "We might say that these self-criticisms in the satires belong to his early life, were it not that in the first book of epistles Horace is as engagingly frank about his failures to attain his ideals".

The chapters which deal with *Country Days* (146-173), *Feeling for Nature* (174-197), *Religion and Philosophy* (198-270) all suffer, in the opinion of the reviewer, from the author's tendency to interpret too literally all that Horace says and to accept as his own opinions those which he puts into the mouth of his characters. The Second Epode is "great poetry" which, as Vergil's *Georgics*, supported and popularized "this imperial encouragement of farming" (147), and is "the clear expression" of "the farmer's hard work and simple joys" (176). The words put into the mouth of the discontented rich man in *Epp.* 1.1.83 become Horace's own saying "that no place in the world is fairer than beautiful *Baiae*" (180; repeated on 197). The poet's humorous reference to the Lucanian coast in his letter to *Vala*, *Epp.* 1.15.16 ff., in which he demands an old and mellow wine to drive away his worries, to instil hope into his heart, to put words into his mouth, and to make him young again in the eyes of a Lucanian lady, becomes a description of "his own joy in the sea-shore, telling of some noble, gentle influence there which drives dull care away..." (180; contrast the statement on 155). All the references in Horace's verse to seas, lakes, rivers, springs, mountains and woods, trees and flowers, animals and birds are brought under review, and the author is not content with her sensible conclusion (194), "that Horace was alive to the outer world, conscious of its influence, and of its artistic place in poetry", but must needs see in such poetic commonplaces as the veiling of the moon's face in the presence of the witches (*Serm.* 1.8.35?), the comparison of young *Telephus* (*Carm.* 3.19.26) and of "Horace's rival with *Lydia*" (*Carm.* 3.9.21), and of young girls (*Carm.* 3.15.6) to stars, evidence that Horace "was sensitive to the beauty" of the heavenly bodies (194). No doubt he was, but such passages do not prove it, any more than his reference to trees and brooks and hills prove that "he was a lover of outdoors" (185). This he certainly was not, at least in our modern sense of the term, for, although he could enjoy a picnic in the woods, an idle hour's meditation by a quiet stream, he must have good weather for it, friends along with the jar of mellow wine. When, however, storms came or it was wintry weather or he was by the sea, he preferred to take his joy indoors by the side of a blazing hearth (181), or to cuddle in a cozy corner with a book (*Epp.* 1.7.12). Sometimes Miss Haight's enthusiasm for Horace as a nature-lover blinds her to his fun, as when (193), in speaking of his use of the moon and stars as setting, she quotes *Serm.* 1.5.9-10, heedless of the humorous incongruity of such language in that connection.

In discussing the religion and the philosophy of Horace Miss Haight found it necessary to review his reflexion of the popular beliefs and practices of his day,

especially those connected with magic and astrology. Her remarks (199-200) on the relations between magic and religion, the essential oneness of their origin, the ease with which what is "magic to one generation may become the religious expression of another age", and on astrology are excellent, and her account, with illustrations drawn from the works of Horace and other poets of the time, is vivid and interesting. If, however, she intends her words on page 207, "Perhaps the shade of a person but lately dead will have more power, so why not kill and use?", to give the reason for the murder of the boy by *Canidia*, she is mistaken, for the real purpose of the rite is to communicate, on the principle of like for like, the unsatisfied longing of the starved boy to the philter and thus make it more potent to arouse desire in the old rake. The translation of the passage from *Epp.* 1.1.33-40, which Miss Haight quotes to illustrate Horace's desire "that life should be guided not by magic rites but by the pursuit of wisdom" (215), would not make this fact clear to the reader who is unfamiliar with the Latin: "If your heart is seething with avarice and wretched passion, there are words and incantations by which you can lighten the pain..." (216). Horace meant by *verba et voces* and Miss Haight understands by them, of course, the soothing precepts of philosophy.

In her reconstruction of Horace's "own personal attitude toward the gods and man's relation to them" (219), Miss Haight "finds three rather distinct periods": "an attitude of criticism of worship that is quasi-irreverent and nearly satirical, a time of acceptance and support of Octavian's renaissance of religion, and a final shifting of posture from the bent knee of religious faith to the erect body and uplifted head of philosophical inquiry". Her arguments in support of this opinion are not entirely free from her tendency to confuse the grave and gay and to overlook the traditions of satire and of lyric, and she neglects entirely the important fact, which *Zielinski* made so clear for Cicero, that every educated Roman had a three-fold religion, an official, state religion which made it incumbent upon him to join with the untutored in the worship of the gods of the State and to uphold the sanctity of the old and hallowed religious rites—even Caesar could be *Pontifex Maximus*—, a poetic or mythological religion which led him to use the stories of ancient gods and heroes to point a moral or adorn a tale, and, finally, a philosophical religion which was the result of the free choice of such as were above the mass. She argues, for example, that, because Horace in his *Sermones* makes fun of gods, oracles, miracles, and then in the *Odes* speaks of Apollo as 'unerring', celebrates *Murena's* entrance into the College of Augurs with banquet and song, records "the miracles that surrounded his childhood and the thunderclap in a clear sky" (220), this is evidence that Horace came to treat "all these religious phenomena with serious respect" (219). Again, because Horace in *Carm.* 3.7 "represents the messenger of an amorous woman as tempting young *Gyges* by telling him stories of great lovers which teach sin" (254), this is evidence that Horace



"sees danger in allegory". When she wishes to illustrate Horace's "mixture of reactions" (258), she remarks, "First, in Satire 1.5 he is Epicurean in rejecting miracles and in his conception of the gods. Then in Ode 1.34, he announces a conversion from that insane philosophy to a belief in the moving finger of Jupiter or Fortune, and we can only infer that seriously or formally he has become a Stoic, perhaps, as I have suggested, through sympathy with Augustus' whole work for reconstruction including his religious renaissance". It is difficult to take such arguments seriously. Travesty of gods and heroes had always had, and continued to have, a place in the satire, and the use which Horace makes of the divinities in his Odes is, as Miss Haight implicitly recognizes elsewhere (226, 242), that sanctioned by the *religio mythologica* of all poets, and neither is necessarily the result of a change of ideas and belief on Horace's part. Often it is nothing more than "a change of poetic attitude toward God" (225). Nor can I believe that the poet's sincere efforts to help Augustus's religious reforms were the result of his "repose on his Sabine farm" through which "he had come to see life steadily and whole" (224). Horace supported Augustus in his reforms for the same reason which led Augustus to establish them; both men were rightly convinced that a *religio civilis*, with its uplifting and unifying belief and ritual, was absolutely necessary for the Roman world. The difficulty, therefore, which she finds (227) in reconciling "with Horace's earlier attitude toward the gods... his position as quasi-poet-laureate for the formalities of the *Ludi Saeculares*" is one which results from her own interpretation and has no basis in fact.

The concluding pages of the book (243-270) are devoted to a discussion of Horace's philosophy. Here the author is at her best. She is more careful in her evaluation of Horace's words about himself, her enthusiasm does not so often carry her astray, and she succeeds better than most in guiding her judgment by the very important truth that "Horace was primarily an artist, not a philosopher..." (266).

The bits of translation with which Miss Haight illustrates her exposition are, on the whole, well done, but she is sometimes not as exact as a teacher of Latin, and above all a lover of Horace, should be, or as careful to strike the right note for her readers. Thus, "braggarts" (31), as a translation of *minaces* in Carm. 2.7.11, to my feeling adds a tone that is absent from the Latin; the point of Carm. 3.16.22-23 is obscured by her rendering (42) of the phrase *contemptae dominus rei* by "a master of the property despised by all", since Horace means 'despised by the rich'; the feminine *maga* is not the word for 'witch' in Horace or his predecessors, as one would infer from her repeated use of it (201-202). The slip in her translation (138) of Carm. 1.16.1, *O matre pulchra filia pulchrior*, "mother fairer than her daughter fair", is, we trust, due to the type-writer, if that is an excuse. To translate *nil mi officit quia*, Serm. 1.9.50, by "it makes no difference to me that" (56), is careless, to say the least; the ox, the symbol of the *Pax Augusti* in Carm. 4.5.17, *tutus bos etenim rura*

perambulat, becomes a very unpoetic symbol through Miss Haight's translation, "for now the ox ambles through the fields safely" (187); "freedom from pain" (259) is certainly an inadequate rendering of the Stoic *ἀπ᾽ αἰνίας*, nor is "freedom from annoyance" (259) very exact for the Epicurean *ἀπάθεια*, for this is what, I suppose, the strange word *ἀπαξίλα* on that page represents. Sometimes, when the author repeats, as she often does, matter which she had used earlier in the book, her statements do not agree. Thus, when she paraphrases Epp. 1.15.16-17 on page 155 it is "mellow old wine which drives away care", on page 180 it is "some noble, gentle influence" of the seashore, on page 265 it is "a mild climate by the sea".

Such faults as my judgment finds in this book are due in very large part to Miss Haight's unbounded enthusiasm and love for Horace, and by a lover of Horace much may be pardoned her on that account. If only she had paid more consistent heed to the poet's own wise restraint: *quo, Musa, tendis?*

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY,  
COLUMBUS, OHIO

MARBURY B. OGLE

Second Latin Book. By B. L. Ullman and N. E. Henry. New York: The Macmillan Company (1925). Pp. xviii+508.

On the whole, the Second Latin Book, by Messrs. Ullman and Henry, seems decidedly more worth-while than Elementary Latin, by the same authors (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 18.214-215). This book, too, contains much more material than can be used in a single year, but the arrangement of its contents is such that it is possible for the individual teacher to select, without loss of continuity, the material that most appeals to him. The authors, however, have not included all the material required by the Syllabus for New York State issued by the Regents of the University of the State of New York, and so the book can not be used effectively in the Public Schools of this State.

The work contains an address To the Teacher (v-x), Translation Helps and Hints (xv-xvii), Vocabulary Notebook (xviii), Part I (1-31), Part II (33-73), Translation Helps and Hints (75-76), Part III (77-199), Part IV (201-357), Written Exercises (359-366), Important Dates and Events in Roman History (367-369), Books for Supplementary Reading or Reference (370-371), Summary of Inflections (372-397), Summary of Syntax (399-416), Summary of Prefixes and Suffixes (417-419), Latin-English Vocabulary (421-488), English-Latin Vocabulary (489-503), Index (504-508).

Part I, "a rapid review of the simpler phases of first-year Latin..." (vi), consists of ten Lessons, made on a uniform plan: (1) the text of a continued story, in 'made' Latin, entitled A Roman Family, (2) a Vocabulary Drill, consisting of fifteen Latin words, (3) a Form Review, with references to the "Appendix" (since the book contains no Appendix, the reference here is evidently to the Summary of Inflections), (4) Drill, on forms, (5) Syntax for Special Review, with references to the Summary of Syntax, (6) Written

Exercises, consisting of five English sentences to be turned into Latin, (7) Word Study, mostly a review of the work on derivation contained in the authors' Elementary Latin.

Part II, which is a "slower review of the subjunctive mood and of other material usually taken up at the end of the first year . . . (vi)", consists of ten Lessons and a two-page Latin play. These Lessons follow the plan of the Lessons in Part I, except that the 'made Latin' now bears the title Two Roman Students. Following it are four or five Latin questions on the text, which are to be answered in Latin.

Part III consists of twenty-two Lessons followed by about twenty pages of Additional Selections for Supplementary or Sight Reading and a six-page Latin play. This section of the book, which seems to the reviewer the most successful part of it, is of great variety. The Lessons follow the general plan of the earlier Lessons, but the text is quoted or adapted from various Latin authors. Livy and Eutropius have made the greatest contribution here, but we find also selections from Cicero, Nepos, Horace, Phaedrus, Aulus Gellius, Seneca, Valerius Maximus, Vergil, Pliny the Younger, Plautus, Terence, Juvenal, Varro, Sallust, Ovid, Catullus, Tacitus, Quintilian, Martial, Claudian, Publilius Syrus, St. Jerome, Thomas à Kempis, and others.

Each Lesson in Part III contains two passages of Latin, one on which the Lesson is based, the other to be used for supplementary reading. The latter consists sometimes only of proverbs, anecdotes, or short quotations. Most of these Lessons contain a list of readings in English on the topic of the text, and it is suggested that the pupil use at least one of them. Some Lessons in Part III contain short lists of Latin idioms to be memorized; many contain a fuller explanation of points of syntax than is offered by the Summary of Syntax.

The reading material in Part III is quite well graded, and although, as has been said, there is more of it than can be used, it seems to the reviewer that this book is unusually successful in opening the eyes of the second year pupil to the vast wealth of Latin literature to which he may be heir, if he will.

Part IV consists of selections from the seven books of Caesar, *De Bello Gallico*, amounting in length to about three books. Books 1 and 2 have been simplified. Summaries in English are given for all omitted passages. Quite full notes are set at the bottom of each page. At intervals are paragraphs of English questions based on the story of the text. Except for the last named feature and for the simplification of Books 1 and 2, Part IV does not differ materially from other recent High School editions of Caesar's Commentaries.

The Written Exercises that follow Part IV consist of twenty sections, each of which contains a grammar

lesson with references to the Summary of Syntax and five English sentences based on the preceding selections from Books 1 and 2 of the Gallic War. These sentences, as well as others in the book, seem to the reviewer much better than the sentences in Elementary Latin. Every one will grant that, at least, they are more dignified.

The rules and explanations given in the Summary of Syntax and also in other parts of the book are clearly and concisely stated. The Translation Helps and Hints (xv-xvii, 75-76) are well done, and follow the suggestions made by the General Report of the Classical Investigation.

The book is attractively made. There are three maps and one hundred and sixty-six illustrations. Some of the illustrations are colored; most of them are clearer than those in Elementary Latin. Noticeable are those relating to the World War, and the one which shows the bust of Augustus (?) recently found embedded in the Hudson River. The 'Movies' have again furnished help to the Classics by supplying scenes for this book from the film-plays Julius Caesar, Antony and Cleopatra, Spartacus, Messalina, The Eternal City, and Ben Hur.

ALBANY TEACHERS COLLEGE

L. ANTOINETTE JOHNSON

#### PHILADELPHIA CLASSICAL SOCIETY

The annual dinner of the Philadelphia Classical Society was held on Thursday evening, November 19. The attendance was unusually large, about 155 being present, and great interest and enthusiasm were shown. Professor G. D. Hadzsits, Chairman of the Society, presided. The chief speaker, Professor J. Duncan Spaeth, of Princeton University, gave a delightful talk on the value of Latin from the point of view of the student and teacher of English. He spoke of the need of an understanding of the spirit of the Latin language; in this, he felt, rather than in the literature of Rome, lay the value of the study of Latin. His address was preceded by five minute talks by six distinguished speakers. Mr. J. P. W. Crawford made an amusing plea for Vulgar Latin, which, he said, would be better understood by the dweller in Rome's slums than the rather 'highbrow' language of Cicero. Miss E. P. Longacker spoke of her experiences in the Summer School of the American Academy in Rome. Professor D. P. Lockwood talked of some of the values of the study of Latin. Professor J. A. Montgomery made an appeal for closer cooperation between classicists and orientalist, pointing out the benefits that this would bring to both. Professor W. B. McDaniel related an interesting experience of his last summer in meeting by accident a Frenchman whose grandfather had been instrumental in securing the Venus of Milo for the Louvre, and who told him some new details about its discovery. Miss Agnes Repplier, in her usual happy and finished manner, regretted the fact that, in spite of our great wealth, the students in our Colleges cannot afford time for the luxury of scholarship, but must be made ready to act as acolytes at the altar of production.

ETHEL L. CHUBB,  
Recording Secretary